arXiv:math-ph/0211021v2 8 Jan 2003

Nambu Dynamics, Deformation Quantization, and Superintegrability

Thomas L Curtright and Cosmas K Zachos

This paper is dedicated to Milton Hendrix (1930-2000).

Abstract. Phase space is a framework ideally suited for quantizing superintegrable systems through the use of deformation methods, as illustrated here by applications to de Sitter and chiral particles. Within this framework, Nambu brackets elegantly incorporate the additional quantum invariants of such models. New results are presented for the non-Abelian quantization of these brackets.

1. Introduction[1]

For systems with velocity-dependent potentials, when quantization of the classical system presents operator ordering ambiguities involving x and p, the general consensus has long been [**1, 2, 3, 4, 5**] to select those orderings in the quantum Hamiltonian which maximally preserve the symmetries present in the corresponding classical Hamiltonian. However, even for simple systems such constructions may become involved and quite technical.

Recently it was emphasized [**29, 30**] that in contrast to conventional operator quantization, the problem of selecting the quantum Hamiltonian which maximally preserves integrability is addressed very directly in Moyal's phase-space quantization formulation [**6, 7, 8**]. Basically, the reason for this is that the kernels involved ("kernel functions" or "Weyl transforms of operators") are c-number functions and have an interpretation analogous to that of the classical phase-space theory, although in general they involve $\hbar$-corrections ("deformations"). This stand-alone formulation of quantum mechanics is based on the Wigner Function (WF), a quasi-probability distribution function in phase-space which comprises the kernel function of the density matrix. Observables and transition amplitudes are phase-space integrals of kernel functions weighted by the WF, in analogy to statistical mechanics.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53D55, 81R60; Secondary 81R50, 37J35.

Key words and phrases. Nambu bracket, deformation quantization, star product, superintegrable, noncommutative geometry.

The first author was supported in part by NSF Award 0073390.

The second author was supported in part by the US Department of Energy, Division of High Energy Physics, Contract W-31-109-ENG-38.

[1] Presented by the first author at the Workshop on Superintegrability in Classical and Quantum Systems, Centre de recherches mathématiques, Université de Montréal, 16-21 Sept 2002.

There is no free lunch, however. Kernel functions compose through the $\star$-product, a noncommutative, associative, pseudodifferential operation, which encodes the entire quantum mechanical action and whose antisymmetrization (commutator) is the Moyal Bracket (MB) [**6, 7, 8**]. Any arbitrary operator ordering can be brought to Weyl-ordering format, by use of Heisenberg commutations, and through Weyl's transform corresponds invertibly to a specific $\hbar$-deformation of the classical kernel [**9, 10**]. Thus, two operators of different orderings correspond to kernel functions differing in their deformation terms of $O(\hbar)$, and the problem of selecting the correct ordering reduces to a purely $\star$-product algebraic one.

Previously, Hietarinta [**11**] has investigated in this phase-space quantization language the simplest integrable systems of velocity-dependent potentials. In each system, he has promoted the vanishing of the Poisson Bracket (PB) of the (one) classical invariant I (conserved integral) with the Hamiltonian, $\{H, I\} = 0$, to the vanishing of its (quantum) Moyal Bracket (MB) with the Hamiltonian, $\{H_{qm}, I_{qm}\}_{MB} = 0$. This dictates quantum corrections, addressed perturbatively in $\hbar$: he has found $O(\hbar^2)$ corrections to the Is and H (V), needed for quantum symmetry. The expressions found are quite simple, as the systems chosen are such that the polynomial character of the ps, or suitable balanced combinations of ps and qs, ensure collapse or subleading termination of the MBs. The specification of the symmetric Hamiltonian then is complete, since the quantum Hamiltonian in terms of classical phase-space variables corresponds uniquely to the Weyl-ordered expression for these variables in operator language. Berry [**12**] has also studied the WFs of integrable systems.

In this contribution we shall review the work in [**29, 30**] and make some extensions of it. We shall discuss nonlinear σ-models to argue for the general principles of power and convenience in isometry-preserving quantization in phase space, particularly for superintegrable situations [**1**]. Briefly, we find that the symmetry generator invariants are undeformed by quantization, but the Casimir invariants of their MB algebras are deformed. Hence the Hamiltonians are also deformed by terms $O(\hbar^2)$, as they consist of quadratic Casimir invariants, but nonetheless their energy spectra can be read off through the usual group theoretic techniques once these are properly adapted to phase space. The basic principles are illustrated for the two-sphere, in Section 2, and then applied to larger classes of symmetric manifolds such as N-spheres, in Section 3, and chiral models, in Section 4.

Finally, in Section 5, the evolution of such systems is formulated in phase-space through the use of Nambu Brackets (NBs) [**13, 17, 18, 19**]. The quantization of Nambu's approach is discussed in detail and compared to the standard Moyal deformation quantization. This last section is the most original part of the paper, and in it we present several new results involving Quantum Nambu Brackets (QNBs). An Appendix indicates how the QNB results can also be expressed in the more traditional language of operators acting on Hilbert space.

2. Basic principles and the 2-sphere

A Hamiltonian system with N degrees of freedom is *integrable* if it has N invariants in involution (globally defined and independent), and *superintegrable* [**1**] if it has additional conservation laws up to a maximum $2N - 1$ invariants. For example, consider a particle constrained to the surface of a unit radius two-sphere S^2, but otherwise moving freely. Thus $N = 2$ and $2N - 1 = 3$. Three independent invariants of this maximally superintegrable system are the angular momenta about the center of the sphere:

$$L_x \ , \quad L_y \ , \quad L_z \ .$$

Actually, no two of these are in involution, but this is quickly remedied, and moreover it isn't much of a hindrance as we shall see below in the Nambu approach to mechanics, an approach that places all invariants on a more equal footing.

To be more explicit, we may coordinate the upper and lower (±) hemispheres by projecting the particle's location onto the equatorial disk, $\big\{(x,y) \mid x^2+y^2 \leq 1\big\}$. The invariants are then

$$\begin{aligned} L_z &= xp_y - yp_x \ , \\ L_y &= \pm\sqrt{1-x^2-y^2}\ p_x \ , \\ L_x &= \mp\sqrt{1-x^2-y^2}\ p_y \ . \end{aligned}$$

The last two are the de Sitter momenta, or nonlinearly realized axial charges, corresponding to the x, y "pions" of this truncated σ-model.

The Poisson Brackets (PBs) of these expressions close into the expected $so(3)$.

$$\{L_x, L_y\}_{PB} = L_z \ , \qquad \{L_y, L_z\}_{PB} = L_x \ , \qquad \{L_z, L_x\}_{PB} = L_y \ .$$

The usual Hamiltonian of the free particle system is the Casimir invariant.

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\left(L_x L_x + L_y L_y + L_z L_z\right) \ .$$

Thus, it immediately follows algebraically that PBs of H with the $\mathbf{L}$ vanish, and time-invariance holds.

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{L} = \{\mathbf{L}, H\}_{PB} = 0 \ .$$

So any one of the Ls and this Casimir constitute a pair of invariants in involution.

In quantizing this system using operators some simple ordering issues arise because the system has an effective momentum-dependent potential.

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\left(1-x^2\right)p_x^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(1-y^2\right)p_y^2 - xyp_xp_y \ .$$

But in the deformation quantization of phase-space one may just insert Groenewold's [**10**] non-commutative but associative $\star$-products[2], defined as

$$\star \equiv \exp\frac{i\hbar}{2}(\overleftarrow{\partial}_x\overrightarrow{\partial}_{p_x} - \overleftarrow{\partial}_{p_x}\overrightarrow{\partial}_x + \overleftarrow{\partial}_y\overrightarrow{\partial}_{p_y} - \overleftarrow{\partial}_{p_y}\overrightarrow{\partial}_y) \ ,$$

at strategic points in the above classical expressions and achieve full quantum integrability. That is, the classical Poisson bracket statements,

$$\{I, H\}_{PB} = 0 \qquad \text{(for invariants)} \ ,$$

may be promoted to quantum Moyal bracket statements,

$$\{I_{qm}, H_{qm}\}_{MB} \equiv \frac{1}{i\hbar}\left(I_{qm} \star H_{qm} - H_{qm} \star I_{qm}\right) = 0 \qquad \text{(for invariants)} \ ,$$

with simple choices for I_{qm} and H_{qm} . As $\hbar \to 0$, the MB reduces to the PB. More importantly, the MB provides the unique route around the Groenewold-van Hove theorem[3]. The $\star$ product is the unique (up to equivalence) one-parameter associative deformation of ordinary products, and the MB is the corresponding deformation of the PB.

---

[2] A general discussion of star products on curved spaces may be found in [**26**] and [**27**].

[3] Groenewold introduced the $\star$-product to evade his "no-go" theorem in the same 1946 paper wherein he proved it, thereby immediately reducing the theorem to a mere appurtenance.

Maximally symmetric phase-space quantization is achieved here by a Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_{qm} = \frac{1}{2}\left(L_x \star L_x + L_y \star L_y + L_z \star L_z\right) \ .$$

The reason is that, in this realization, there are no $O(\hbar)$ corrections to the individual **L**s. These particular invariants are undeformed by quantization.

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{L}_{qm} \ .$$

The algebra of the **L**s is then promoted to the corresponding MB expression *without any modification*, since all "**L** with **L**" MBs collapse to PBs by the linearity in momenta of the arguments. Consequently, given associativity for $\star$, the corresponding quantum quadratic Casimir invariant $\mathbf{L}\cdot\star\mathbf{L}$ has vanishing MBs with **L**, and automatically generates a symmetry-preserving time-evolution. The $\star$-product in this Hamiltonian trivially evaluates to expose a quantum correction to the classical phase-space energy:

$$H_{qm} = H + \frac{\hbar^2}{8}\left(\frac{1}{1-x^2-y^2} - 3\right) .$$

Thus we have

$$\{\mathbf{L}, H_{qm}\}_{MB} = 0 \neq \{\mathbf{L}, H\}_{MB} \ .$$

Also note there will be quantum corrections to the classical equations of motion for (p_x, p_y), but not (x, y).

In phase-space quantization [**6, 7, 8**], the Wigner function (WF) $f\,(x, p_x, y, p_y)$, the Weyl kernel function of the density operator, evolves according to Moyal's equation [**6**].

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \{H_{qm}, f\}_{MB} \ .$$

In addition to it, the WFs for pure stationary states also satisfy Fairlie's "$\star$-genvalue" equations [**20, 7**] specifying the spectrum.

$$H_{qm}(x,p) \star f(x,p) = f(x,p) \star H_{qm}(x,p) =$$
$$H_{qm}\left(x + \frac{i\hbar}{2}\overrightarrow{\partial}_p \ , \ p - \frac{i\hbar}{2}\overrightarrow{\partial}_x\right) \ f(x,p) = E \ f(x,p) \ .$$

Eigenvalue problems of this type also occur in spectral theory for (special) Jordan algebras, a point to be re-emphasized below.

The spectrum of this Hamiltonian, then, is proportional to the $\hbar^2 l(l+1)$ spectrum of the $so(3)$ Casimir invariant $\mathbf{L}\cdot\star\mathbf{L} = L_+ \star L_- + L_z \star L_z - \hbar L_z$, for integer l [**21**]. This can be proved algebraically by the identical standard recursive ladder operations in quantum phase-space which are used in the operator formalism Fock space,

$$L_z \star L_+ - L_+ \star L_z = \hbar L_+ \ ,$$

where $L_\pm \equiv L_x \pm i L_y$. From the *real $\star$-square theorem* [**22**], it follows that

$$\langle \mathbf{L}\cdot\star\mathbf{L} - L_z \star L_z \rangle = \langle L_x \star L_x + L_y \star L_y \rangle \geq 0 \ .$$

The $\star$-genvalues of L_z, m, are thus bounded, $|m| \leq l < \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{L}\cdot\star\mathbf{L}\rangle}/\hbar$, necessitating $L_- \star f_{m=-l} = 0$. Hence

$$L_+ \star L_- \star f_{-l} = 0 = (\mathbf{L}\cdot\star\mathbf{L} - L_z \star L_z + \hbar L_z) \star f_{-l} \ ,$$

and consequently $\langle \mathbf{L}\cdot\star\mathbf{L}\rangle = \hbar^2 l(l+1)$. Similar $\star$-ladder arguments and inequalities apply directly in phase space to all Lie algebras.

Classical Hamiltonians are scalars under canonical transformations, but it should not be assumed that the quantum mechanical expression above is a canonical scalar [**29**]. For canonical transformations in phase-space quantization see [**7**]. The $\star$-product and WFs are also not invariant under canonical transformations, in general, but transform in a suitable quantum covariant way [**7**], so as to yield an identical MB algebra and $\star$-genvalue equations, and thus spectrum, following from the identical group theoretical construction.

3. Quantum N-sphere

For the generic sphere models, S^N, the maximally symmetric Hamiltonians are the quadratic Casimir invariants of $so(N+1)$,

$$H = \frac{1}{2}P_a P_a + \frac{1}{4}L_{ab}L_{ab} \ ,$$

where again in terms of equatorial plane coordinates

$$L_{ab} = q^a p_b - q^b p_a \ , \qquad\qquad P_a = \sqrt{1-q^2}\ p_a \ ,$$

for $a = 1, \cdots, N$, $q^2 = \sum_{a=1}^N q^a q^a$. These are the usual angular and de Sitter momenta of $so(N+1)/so(N)$. All of these $N(N+1)/2$ sphere transformations are symmetries of the classical Hamiltonian. (There are more of them than the $2N-1$ allowed *independent* invariants on the phase-space, if $N > 2$. We will explain how to select $2N-1$ independent invariants later, when we discuss Nambu brackets.)

Quantization proceeds as in S^2, maintaining conservation of all P_a and L_{ab},

$$H_{qm} = \frac{1}{2}P_a \star P_a + \frac{1}{4}L_{ab}\star L_{ab} \ ,$$

and hence the quantum correction is

$$H_{qm} - H = \frac{\hbar^2}{8}\left(\frac{1}{1-q^2} - 1 - N(N-1)\right) \ .$$

The spectra are proportional to the Casimir eigenvalues $l(l+N-1)$ for integer l [**21**]. (For $N=3$, this form is reconciled with the Casimir expression in the next section as $l = 2j$, and agrees with [**3, 4, 5**]).

Can the above quantum Hamiltonian be expressed geometrically through the use of tangent-space methods? The classical description is indeed simple upon utilization of Vielbeine.

$$g_{ab} = \delta_{ij}V_a^i V_b^j = \delta_{ab} + \frac{1}{1-q^2}q^a q^b \ , \quad g^{ab} = \delta_{ab} - q^a q^b \ , \quad g^{ab}V_a^i V_b^j = \delta^{ij} \ .$$

For the generic sphere models, S^N, standard choices for the Vielbeine are

$$V_a^i = \delta_{ai} - \frac{q^a q^i}{q^2}\left(1 \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-q^2}}\right), \qquad V^{ai} = \delta_{ai} - \frac{q^a q^i}{q^2}\left(1 \pm \sqrt{1-q^2}\right) \ .$$

The classical Hamiltonian equals

$$H = \frac{1}{2}(p_a V^{ai})(V^{bi}p_b) \ ,$$

but the quantum Hamiltonian is *not* equal to the obvious guess

$$H_{other} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(p_a V^{ai}) \star (V^{bi} p_b) \neq H_{qm} \ .$$

Although we will see below how this simple form *does* apply in chiral models, particularly for the S^3 case, through a different choice of Dreibeine.

The MBs of cotangent bundle currents, for a general manifold, do not close among the Vielbein-currents, but instead,

$$\left\{V^{aj}p_a, V^{bk}p_b\right\}_{MB} = \omega^{a[jk]}p_a = \left(V^{bk}\partial_b V^{aj} - V^{bj}\partial_b V^{ak}\right) p_a \ ,$$

where for the N-sphere

$$\omega^{a[ij]} = \left(\delta^{ai}q^j - \delta^{aj}q^i\right)\ w \ , \qquad w \equiv (1-\sqrt{1-q^2})/q^2 \ ,$$

choosing the $-$ sign in the definition of the Vielbeine so $V^{aj} = \delta_{aj} - q^a q^j w$. It follows that

$$H_{qm} - H_{other} = \frac{1}{8}\hbar^2 \left(N-1\right)\left(1-2w-N\right) \ .$$

H_{other} corresponds to a different operator ordering in the conventional Hilbert space formulation, and has less symmetry than H_{qm}. H_{other} conserves the rotations L_{ab} (i.e. it is symmetric under the $SO(N)$ stability subgroup for S^N). However, it does not conserve the Vielbein-currents on the N-sphere, nor does it conserve the de Sitter momenta. This last statement follows from the above difference $H_{qm} - H_{other}$ dictating,

$$\left\{H_{other}, P_c\right\}_{MB} = \left\{H_{other} - H_{qm}, P_c\right\}_{MB} = \hbar^2 q^c (N-1)\left(\frac{2w-1}{4q^2}\right) \neq 0 \ .$$

Nevertheless, it can be shown that a $\star$-similarity transformation compensates for the difference in these Hamiltonians. Consider

$$w^{-\frac{(N-1)}{2}} \star p_a V^{aj} \star w^{\frac{(N-1)}{2}} = w^{1-N} \star \left(p_a V^{aj} w^{N-1}\right) = V^{aj}p_a - \tfrac{1}{2} i\hbar \left(N-1\right) V^{aj}\partial_a \ln w,$$

and the complex conjugate transformation

$$w^{\frac{(N-1)}{2}} \star p_a V^{aj} \star w^{-\frac{(N-1)}{2}} = \left(w^{N-1}V^{aj}p_a\right) \star w^{1-N} = V^{aj}p_a + \tfrac{1}{2} i\hbar \left(N-1\right) V^{aj}\partial_a \ln w.$$

Associativity of the $\star$-product then allows the maximally symmetric real Hamiltonian to be written as

$$H_{qm} = \frac{1}{2}\left(w^{N-1}V^{aj}p_a\right) \star w^{-2(N-1)} \star \left(w^{N-1}V^{bj}p_b\right) .$$

Using homogeneous coordinates on the sphere, $w = 1/\left(1+\cos\theta\right)$, where θ is the polar angle.

4. Chiral Models

The treatment of the 3-sphere S^3 also accords to the standard chiral model technology using left- and right-invariant Vielbeine. Specifically, the two choices for such Dreibeine for the 3-sphere are [**23**]: $q^2 = x^2 + y^2 + z^2$

$$^{(\pm)}V_a^i = \epsilon^{iab}q^b \pm \sqrt{1-q^2}\ g_{ai} \ , \qquad\qquad ^{(\pm)}V^{ai} = \epsilon^{iab}q^b \pm \sqrt{1-q^2}\ \delta^{ai} \ .$$

The corresponding right and left conserved charges (left- and right-invariant, respectively) then are

$$\mathcal{R}^i = \ ^{(+)}V_a^i\ \frac{d}{dt}q^a = \ ^{(+)}V^{ai}p_a \ , \qquad\qquad \mathcal{L}^i = \ ^{(-)}V_a^i\ \frac{d}{dt}q^a = \ ^{(-)}V^{ai}p_a \ .$$

More intuitive than those for S^2 are the linear combinations into Axial and Isospin charges (again linear in the momenta),

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\,(\mathcal{R}-\mathcal{L}) = \sqrt{1-q^2}\ \mathbf{p} \equiv \mathbf{A}\ , \qquad \tfrac{1}{2}\,(\mathcal{R}+\mathcal{L}) = \mathbf{q}\times\mathbf{p} \equiv \mathbf{I}\ .$$

It can easily be seen that the $\mathcal{L}$s and the $\mathcal{R}$s have PBs closing into standard $su(2)\otimes su(2)$, ie, $su(2)$ relations within each set, and vanishing between the two sets. Thus they are seen to be constant, since the Hamiltonian (and also the Lagrangian) can, in fact, be written in terms of either quadratic Casimir invariant.

$$H = \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}\cdot\mathcal{L} = \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}\cdot\mathcal{R}\ .$$

Quantization consistent with integrability thus proceeds as above for the 2-sphere, since the MB algebra collapses to PBs again, and so the quantum invariants $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ again coincide with the classical ones, without deformation (quantum corrections). The $\star$-product is now the obvious generalization to 6-dimensional phase-space. The eigenvalues of the relevant Casimir invariant are now $j(j+1)$, for half-integer j. However, for this chiral model the symmetric quantum Hamiltonian is simpler, geometrically, than that of the previous N-sphere, since it can also be written as

$$H_{qm} = \frac{1}{2}(p_a V^{ai})\star(V^{bi}p_b) = \frac{1}{2}\left(g^{ab}p_a p_b + \frac{\hbar^2}{4}\partial_a V^{bi}\partial_b V^{ai}\right) = \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}\cdot\star\mathcal{L} = \tfrac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}\cdot\star\mathcal{R}\ .$$

No $\star$-similarity transformations are needed for chiral models, unlike the general N-sphere. The Dreibeine throughout this formula can be either ${}^{+}V^i_a$ or ${}^{-}V^i_a$, corresponding to either the right- or the left-acting quadratic Casimir invariant. The quantum correction then amounts to

$$H_{qm} - H = \frac{\hbar^2}{8}\left(\frac{1}{1-q^2} - 7\right)\ .$$

This expression again is not canonically invariant. Eg, in gnomonic PR_N coordinates[4], it is $\frac{3}{4}\hbar^2(Q^2-1)$, ie, it has not transformed as a canonical scalar [**7, 29**]. Note, however, that either of these quantum corrections are $\geq -\frac{3}{4}\hbar^2$ on the manifold.

In general, the above discussion also applies to all chiral models, with the algebra for a chiral group G replacing $su(2)$ above. Ie, the Vielbein-momenta combinations $V^{aj}p_a$ represent algebra generator invariants, whose quadratic Casimir group invariants yield the respective Hamiltonians, and whence the properly $\star$-ordered quantum Hamiltonians as above.

That is to say, for [**24**] group matrices U generated by exponentiated constant group algebra matrices T weighted by functions of the particle coordinates q, we have

$$iU^{-1}\frac{d}{dt}U = {}^{(+)}V^j_a T_j \frac{d}{dt}q^a = {}^{(+)}V^{aj}p_a T_j\ , \qquad iU\frac{d}{dt}U^{-1} = {}^{(-)}V^{aj}p_a T_j\ ,$$

It follows that PBs of left- and right-invariant charges,

$${}^{(\pm)}V^{aj}p_a = \frac{i}{2}Tr\left(T_j U^{\mp 1}\frac{d}{dt}U^{\pm 1}\right)\ ,$$

close to the identical Lie algebras,

$$\{{}^{(\pm)}V^{aj}p_a, {}^{(\pm)}V^{bk}p_b\}_{PB} = -2f^{jkn}\ {}^{(\pm)}V^{an}p_a\ ,$$

---

[4] The inverse gnomonic Vielbein is polynomial, $\mathsf{V}^{aj} = \delta^{aj} + Q^j Q^a + \epsilon^{jab}Q^b$. See [**4**].

and PB commute with each other,

$$\{ {}^{(+)}V^{aj}p_a, {}^{(-)}V^{bk}p_b\}_{PB} = 0 \ .$$

These two statements are implicit in [**24**] as well as throughout the literature, and are fully explicated in [**29**].

MBs collapse to PBs by linearity in momenta as before, and the Hamiltonian is again the simple form

$$H_{qm} = \frac{1}{2}(p_a V^{ai}) \star (V^{bi}p_b) \ .$$

The spectra are given by the Casimir eigenvalues for the relevant algebras and representations. The quantum correction is now found to be

$$H_{qm} - H = \frac{\hbar^2}{8} \left(\Gamma^b_{ac}\, g^{cd} \Gamma^a_{bd} - f_{ijk} f_{ijk} \right) \ ,$$

(reducing to the previous result for S^3). In operator language, this Hamiltonian amounts to an obvious Weyl-ordering of all products [**29**].

5. Nambu Dynamics

All the models considered above have extra invariants beyond the number of conserved quantities in involution (mutually commuting) required for integrability in the Liouville sense. The most systematic way of accounting for such additional invariants, and placing them all on a more equal footing, even when they do not all simultaneously commute, is the Nambu bracket formalism.

5.1. Classical Nambu Mechanics.

For example, the classical mechanics of a particle on an N-sphere as discussed above may be summarized elegantly through Nambu mechanics in phase space [**13, 18**]. Specifically, [**17, 19**], in an N-dimensional space, and thus $2N$-dimensional phase space, motion is confined on the constant surfaces specified by the algebraically independent integrals of the motion (eg, L_x, L_y, L_z for S^2 above.) Therefore, the phase-space velocity $\mathbf{v} = (\dot{\mathbf{q}}, \dot{\mathbf{p}})$ is always perpendicular to the $2N$-dimensional phase-space gradients $\nabla = (\partial_{\mathbf{q}}, \partial_{\mathbf{p}})$ of all these integrals of the motion.

As a consequence, if there are $2N-1$ algebraically independent such integrals (ie, the system is maximally superintegrable [**1**]), the phase-space velocity must be proportional [**17**] to the cross-product of all those gradients, and hence the motion is fully specified for any phase-space function $k(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ by a phase-space Jacobian which amounts to the Nambu Bracket.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dk}{dt} &\equiv \{k, I_1, \cdots, I_{2N-1}\}_{NB} = \mathbf{v} \cdot \nabla k \\ &\propto \partial_{i_1} k \; \epsilon^{i_1 i_2 \cdots i_{2N}} \; \partial_{i_2} I_1 \cdots \partial_{i_{2N}} I_{2N-1} = \frac{\partial(k, I_1, \cdots, \cdots, I_{2N-1})}{\partial(q_1, p_1, q_2, p_2, \cdots, q_N, p_N)} \ . \end{aligned}$$

For instance, consider the above S^2 case to find the concise result

$$\frac{dk}{dt} = \frac{\partial(k, L_x, L_y, L_z)}{\partial(x, p_x, y, p_y)} \ .$$

For the more general S^N, one now has a choice of $2N-1$ of the $N(N+1)/2$ invariants of $so(N+1)$. One of several possible expressions is

$$\frac{dk}{dt} = \frac{(-1)^{N-1}}{P_2 P_3 \cdots P_{N-1}} \frac{\partial\left(k, P_1, L_{12}, P_2, L_{23}, P_3, \cdots, P_{N-1}, L_{N-1\,N}, P_N\right)}{\partial\left(x_1, p_1, x_2, p_2, \cdots, x_N, p_N\right)} ,$$

where $P_a = \sqrt{1-q^2}\; p_a$, for $a = 1, \cdots, N$, and $L_{a,a+1} = q^a p_{a+1} - q^{a+1} p_a$, for $a = 1, \cdots, N-1$. In general [**18**], classical NBs are Jacobian determinants and possess all antisymmetries of such. As they are linear in all derivatives, they also obey the Leibniz rule of partial differentiation.

$$\{k(L,M), f_1, f_2, \cdots\}_{NB} = \frac{\partial k}{\partial L}\{L, f_1, f_2, \cdots\}_{NB} + \frac{\partial k}{\partial M}\{M, f_1, f_2, \cdots\}_{NB} .$$

Thus, an entry in the NB algebraically dependent on the rest leads to a vanishing bracket. For example, it is seen directly from above that the Hamiltonian is constant,

$$\frac{dH}{dt} = \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{L}\cdot\mathbf{L}}{2}, \cdots \right\}_{NB} = 0 ,$$

since each term of this NB vanishes. This also applies to all explicit examples discussed here, as they are all maximally superintegrable.

The impossibility to antisymmetrize more than $2N$ indices in $2N$-dimensional phase space,

$$\epsilon^{ab\cdots .c[i}\epsilon^{j_1 j_2 \cdots j_{2N}]} = 0 ,$$

leads to the so-called "fundamental identity" [**18**], slightly generalized here. For any f_i, g_j, and V,

$$\begin{aligned} &\{V\{g_1, \cdots, g_{2N-1}, f_1\}_{NB}, f_2, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB} \\ &+ \{f_1, V\{g_1, \cdots, g_{2N-1}, f_2\}_{NB}, f_3, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB} \\ &+ \cdots + \{f_1, \cdots, f_{2N-1}, V\{g_1, \cdots, g_{2N-1}, f_{2N}\}_{NB}\}_{NB} \\ &= \{g_1, \cdots, g_{2N-1}, V\{f_1, f_2, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB}\}_{NB} . \end{aligned}$$

The proportionality factor V in

$$\frac{dk}{dt} = V\{k, I_1, \cdots, I_{2N-1}\}_{NB} ,$$

has to be a time-invariant [**19**] if it has no *explicit* time dependence. This is seen from consistency of

$$\frac{d}{dt}(V\{f_1, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB}) = \dot{V}\{f_1, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB} + V\{\dot{f}_1, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB} + \cdots + V\{f_1, \cdots, \dot{f}_{2N}\}_{NB} .$$

where $\dot{V} = \frac{dV}{dt}$, etc. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} &V\{V\{f_1, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB}, I_1, \cdots, I_{2N-1}\}_{NB} = \dot{V}\{f_1, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB} \\ &+V\{V\{f_1, I_1, \cdots, I_{2N-1}\}_{NB}, \cdots, f_{2N}\}_{NB} + \cdots + V\{f_1, \cdots, V\{f_{2N}, I_1, \cdots, I_{2N-1}\}_{NB}\}_{NB} , \end{aligned}$$

and, by virtue of the FI, $\frac{dV}{dt} = 0$ follows [**29**].

Actually, PBs result from a maximal reduction of NBs, by inserting $2N-2$ phase-space coordinates and summing over them, thereby taking *symplectic traces*,

$$\{L, M\}_{PB} = \frac{1}{(N-1)!}\left\{L, M, x_{i_1}, p_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_{N-1}}, p_{i_{N-1}}\right\}_{NB} ,$$

where summation over all $N-1$ pairs of repeated indices is understood. Fewer traces lead to relations between NBs of maximal rank, $2N$, and those of lesser rank, $2k$,

$$\{L_1, \cdots, L_{2k}\}_{NB} = \frac{1}{(N-k)!} \{L_1, \cdots, L_{2k}, x_{i_1}, p_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_{N-k}}, p_{i_{N-k}}\}_{NB} \ ,$$

(which is one way to define the lower rank NBs for $k \neq 1$), or between two lesser rank NBs. A complete theory of these relations has not been developed; but, naively, $\{L_1, \cdots, L_{2k}\}_{NB}$ acts like a Dirac Bracket (DB) up to a normalization, $\{L_1, L_2\}_{DB}$, where the fixed additional entries $L_3, \cdots, L_{2k}$ in the NB play the role of the constraints in the DB. (In effect, this has been previously observed, e.g., [**18, 19**], for the extreme case $N = k$, without symplectic traces.)

By applying this symplectic trace to a general system—not only a superintegrable one—Hamilton's equations admit an NB expression different than Nambu's original one, namely

$$\frac{dk}{dt} = \{k, H\}_{PB} = \frac{1}{(N-1)!} \{k, H, x_{i_1}, p_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_{N-1}}, p_{i_{N-1}}\}_{NB} \ .$$

5.2. Quantum Nambu Mechanics. Despite considerable interest in the problem for nearly 30 years, the quantization of the Nambu formalism was not completely settled until recently. We believe a transparent, user-friendly technique is now at hand (see [**29, 30**]). The problem of quantizing Nambu brackets *might* be solved by the Abelian deformation method [**25**], but this is not yet clear.

Remarkably, however, the quantization is completely solved by Nambu's original method, when consistently applied to the phase-space formalism. Define quantum Nambu brackets (QNBs)

$$[A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k]_\star \equiv \sum_{\substack{\text{all } k! \text{ perms } \{p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_k\} \\ \text{of the indices } \{1,2,\cdots,k\}}} (-1)^{\pi(p)} A_{p_1} \star A_{p_2} \star \cdots \star A_{p_k} \ .$$

Use these anti-symmetrized $\star$-products in the quantum theory instead of the previous jacobians. This approach grants in an obvious way only one of three mathematical desiderata: *full antisymmetry.* With these definitions, the Leibniz property and the Fundamental Identity are not manifestly satisfied. But to some extent, the apparent loss of the latter two properties is a subjective shortcoming, and dependent on the specific application context.

Even order QNBs may always be resolved into sums of products of commutators: $[A, B]_\star = A \star B - B \star A$. For instance,

$$\begin{aligned} [A, B, C, D]_\star = {} & [A, B]_\star \star [C, D]_\star - [A, C]_\star \star [B, D]_\star - [A, D]_\star \star [C, B]_\star \\ & + [C, D]_\star \star [A, B]_\star - [B, D]_\star \star [A, C]_\star - [C, B]_\star \star [A, D]_\star \ . \end{aligned}$$

Let us use this fact and re-consider the S^2 example. The result is a combinatoric identity relating 4 brackets to commutators.

$$[A, L_x, L_y, L_z]_\star = i\hbar \, [A, L_x \star L_x + L_y \star L_y + L_z \star L_z]_\star \ ,$$

as follows from the $su(2)$ MB algebra and the commutator resolution of the 4-bracket. Therefore in this case the Leibniz properties (and the particular FIs corresponding to them) *are* satisfied, leading to an effective fundamental identity (EFI). Explicitly,

$$[A \star B, L_x, L_y, L_z]_\star = A \star [B, L_x, L_y, L_z]_\star + [A, L_x, L_y, L_z]_\star \star B \ .$$

As a consequence, time evolution of any WF for S^2 is given by the QNB expression:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2\,(i\hbar)^2}\,[L_x, L_y, L_z, f]_\star \ .$$

In particular, this approach is in agreement with the $\star$-product quantization of the equations of motion.

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \frac{-1}{2\hbar^2}\,[x, L_x, L_y, L_z]_\star \ , \qquad \frac{dp_x}{dt} = \frac{-1}{2\hbar^2}\,[p_x, L_x, L_y, L_z]_\star \ ,$$

where the second of these does indeed incorporate the previously given quantum correction.

How does the use of 4-brackets extend to other examples? Any Lie algebra will allow a commutator with a quadratic Casimir to be rewritten as a *sum* of 4-brackets. Suppose

$$[Q_a, Q_b]_\star = i\hbar f_{abc} Q_c \ ,$$

in a basis where f_{abc} is totally antisymmetric (this particular choice of basis is helpful, but not crucial). Then for a *sum* (over all repeated indices) of quantum Nambu 4-brackets we have

$$f_{abc}\,[A, Q_a, Q_b, Q_c]_\star = [A, f_{abc}\,[Q_a, Q_b, Q_c]_\star]_\star \ .$$

Only a commutator with the trilinear invariant survives. Moreover, this trilinear invariant reduces to the quadratic Casimir.

$$f_{abc}\,[Q_a, Q_b, Q_c]_\star = 3 f_{abc} Q_a \star [Q_b, Q_c]_\star = 3i\hbar f_{abc} f_{bcd} Q_a \star Q_d \ .$$

For simple Lie algebras (with appropriately normalized charges) we have

$$f_{abc} f_{bcd} = c_{\text{adjoint}}\,\delta_{ad} \ ,$$

where c_{adjoint} is a *number*. For example, $c_{\text{adjoint}} = N$ for $su\,(N)$.

So we obtain the Casimir $Q_a \star Q_a$

$$f_{abc}\,[Q_a, Q_b, Q_c]_\star = 3i\hbar\, c_{\text{adjoint}}\, Q_a \star Q_a \ ,$$

and we conclude that

$$f_{abc}\,[A, Q_a, Q_b, Q_c]_\star = 3i\hbar\, c_{\text{adjoint}}\ [A, Q_a \star Q_a]_\star \ .$$

As a corollary, we again have the effective 4-bracket fundamental identity (EFI)

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{abc}\,[Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, [A, B, \cdots, D]_\star]_\star \\ &\quad = f_{abc}\,[[Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, A]_\star, B, \cdots, D]_\star + f_{abc}\,[A, [Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, B]_\star, \cdots, D]_\star + \cdots \\ &\qquad\qquad + f_{abc}\,[A, B, \cdots, [Q_a, Q_b, Q_c, D]_\star]_\star \ . \end{aligned}$$

By using this result, *all* the models above can be quantized through the use of QNBs to describe the time evolution of their WFs.

More than three invariants may also be incorporated into a QNB. Only a careful and complete physical interpretation of the result is needed in the general case. For example, for S^N with $N > 2$ a full set of $2N-1$ invariants leads from the previously given classical jacobian to a QNB:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial\,(f, P_1, L_{12}, P_2, \cdots, P_{N-1}, L_{N-1\ N}, P_N)}{\partial\,(x_1, p_1, x_2, p_2, \cdots, x_N, p_N)} &= (-1)^{N-1}\, P_2 \cdots P_{N-1} \frac{df}{dt} \\ &= (-1)^{N-1}\, \frac{d}{dt}\,(P_2 \cdots P_{N-1} f) \ , \end{aligned}$$

becomes, for $\hbar \neq 0$,

$$\frac{1}{(i\hbar)^N N}\left[f, P_1, L_{12}, P_2, \cdots, P_{N-1}, L_{N-1\,N}, P_N\right]_\star = (-1)^{N-1}\frac{d}{dt}\left\{P_2, \cdots, P_{N-1}, f\right\}_\star$$
$$+ \quad \textit{quantum-connection terms} \ .$$

The invariants appearing in the totally symmetric generalization of the Jordan product [**14, 28**],

$$\{A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k\}_\star \equiv \sum_{\substack{\text{all } k! \text{ perms } \{p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_k\} \\ \text{of the indices } \{1,2,\cdots,k\}}} A_{p_1} \star A_{p_2} \star \cdots \star A_{p_k} \ ,$$

on the above RHS,

$$\left\{P_2, P_3, \cdots, P_{N-1}, \frac{df}{dt}\right\}_\star = \frac{d}{dt}\left\{P_2, P_3, \cdots, P_{N-1}, f\right\}_\star \ ,$$

will have the effect to set, through their net (but *not* simultaneous, individual) eigenvalues, a variable, dynamical time scale for evolution of the various eigen-WFs.

In addition, the "quantum-connection terms" represent higher order corrections, in powers of $\hbar$, corresponding to group rotations of f that will be described fully elsewhere. For example, if f is the bilinear

$$f_{ab} \equiv (L_a + P_a) \star (L_b - P_b) \ .$$

then $df_{ab}/dt = 0$ for a particle moving freely on the surface of the 3-sphere, but the corresponding group rotation is *not* zero. Hence the six bracket reduces entirely to these quantum connection terms. Explicitly we find

$$\left[f_{ab}, P_x, L_z, P_y, L_x, P_z\right]_\star = 4i\hbar^5 \sum_c \left(\varepsilon_{b2c} f_{ac} - \varepsilon_{a2c} f_{cb}\right) \ .$$

Note that the rotation on the RHS here is a quantum effect, and vanishes in the classical limit as given by

$$\lim_{\hbar \to 0} \left[f_{ab}, P_x, L_z, P_y, L_x, P_z\right]_\star / \hbar^3 = 0 \ .$$

We believe such a complete physical interpretation explains the perceived failure of the Leibniz rules and FI in the general situation, in a transparent way, and is the only additional ingredient required for a successful *non-Abelian* quantum implementation of the most general Nambu brackets. *A priori*, this approach could conceivably be equivalent to the Abelian deformation approach [**25**], but no one has shown this.

These points are worth re-emphasizing for the 3-sphere expressed in the chiral language. Again, let us use $\mathcal{L}_i$ and $\mathcal{R}_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3 \sim x, y, z)$ for the mutually commuting $su(2)$ charges.

$$\left[\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{L}_j\right]_\star = i\hbar\varepsilon_{ijk}\mathcal{L}_k \ , \quad \left[\mathcal{R}_i, \mathcal{R}_j\right]_\star = i\hbar\varepsilon_{ijk}\mathcal{R}_k \ , \quad \left[\mathcal{L}_i, \mathcal{R}_j\right]_\star = 0 \ .$$

Define the usual quadratic Casimirs for the left and right $su(2)$'s:

$$I_{\mathcal{L}} = \sum_i \mathcal{L}_i \star \mathcal{L}_i \ , \quad I_{\mathcal{R}} = \sum_i \mathcal{R}_i \star \mathcal{R}_i \ .$$

We find the simple result:

$$\begin{aligned}\left[f, F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right), \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y\right]_\star &= (i\hbar)^2 \left\{\left[f, F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right)\right]_\star, \mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_z\right\}_\star \\ &= (i\hbar)^2 \left[\left\{f, \mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_z\right\}_\star, F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right)\right]_\star \ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right)$ is *any* $\star$*-function* of the left and right Casimirs. Physically, this Nambu bracket is simply time evolution generated by the Hamiltonian $H \equiv F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right)$ with the Jordan-like eigenvalues σ, of

$$\left\{f, \mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_z\right\}_\star = \sigma f \ ,$$

setting the time scales for the various sectors of the theory: i.e. *dynamical time scales*. In particular this is true for the choices $F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right) = I_{\mathcal{L}}$ or $F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right) = I_{\mathcal{R}}$, choices relevant for the particle on the 3-sphere.

A complete set of solutions consists of all WFs of the form $f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_z \star f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} &= \lambda_1 f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} \ , \quad f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} \star \mathcal{L}_z = \lambda_2 f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} \ , \\ \mathcal{R}_z \star f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} &= \rho_1 f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} \ , \quad f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} \star \mathcal{R}_z = \rho_2 f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} \ .\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\left\{f, \mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_z\right\}_\star = \sigma_{12} f$ with

$$\sigma_{12} = 2\lambda_1\rho_1 + \lambda_1\rho_2 + \rho_1\lambda_2 + 2\lambda_2\rho_2 \ ,$$

since

$$\left\{f, \mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_z\right\}_\star = \left\{\mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_z\right\}_\star \star f + \mathcal{L}_z \star f \star \mathcal{R}_z + \mathcal{R}_z \star f \star \mathcal{L}_z + f \star \left\{\mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_z\right\}_\star \ .$$

So the time scale is indeed dynamical, and given by σ_{12}.

The simple Leibniz rule for generic f and g, that would equate

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[f \star g, F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right), \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y\right]_\star \qquad \text{and} \\ &f \star \left[g, F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right), \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y\right]_\star + \left[f, F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right), \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y\right]_\star \star g \ ,\end{aligned}$$

will fail for products $f_{\lambda_1\rho_1,\lambda_2\rho_2} \star g_{\lambda_2\rho_2,\lambda_3\rho_3}$ unless

$$\sigma_{12} = \sigma_{23} = \sigma_{13} \ .$$

There is no quantum-connection term in this particular case due to our choice for the invariants in the bracket $\left[f, F\left(I_{\mathcal{L}}, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right), \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y\right]_\star$. The more general situation is revealed by a different choice as follows:

$$\left[f, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y, \mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y\right]_\star = \tfrac{3}{2} (i\hbar)^2 \left[\left\{f, \mathcal{R}_z\right\}_\star, I_{\mathcal{L}}\right]_\star + \tfrac{1}{2} (i\hbar)^2 \sum_i \left[\, \left[\left[f, \mathcal{L}_i\right]_\star, \mathcal{L}_i\right]_\star \, , \, \mathcal{R}_z \,\right]_\star \ ,$$

or equivalently

$$\left[f, \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y, \mathcal{R}_z, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y\right]_\star = \tfrac{3}{2} (i\hbar)^2 \left[\left\{f, \mathcal{L}_z\right\}_\star, I_{\mathcal{R}}\right]_\star + \tfrac{1}{2} (i\hbar)^2 \sum_i \left[\, \left[\left[f, \mathcal{R}_i\right]_\star, \mathcal{R}_i\right]_\star \, , \, \mathcal{L}_z \,\right]_\star \ .$$

These are the exact results for these QNBs. The first terms (single commutators) on the RHS's are inherently $O\left(\hbar^3\right)$, and encode the expected time evolution for Nambu quantum dynamics, while the second terms (triple commutators) are $O\left(\hbar^5\right)$. One is tempted to interpret these extra terms as some type of covariant completion for this particular example of Nambu time evolution, with "quantum connections" as the given higher order effects in $\hbar$.

As a test case, again take f to be a bilinear $f_{ab} \equiv \mathcal{L}_a \star \mathcal{R}_b$ of specific left and right charges. Since $\star$ commutators are indeed $\star$ derivations, all $\star$ functions of the six possible $\mathcal{L}_a$ and $\mathcal{R}_b$ charges commute with the Casimirs, so the first terms on the RHS's of the last two equations vanish for $f = f_{ab}$ (i.e. f_{ab} for a particle moving freely on the surface of a 3-sphere has no time derivatives). However, the second terms on the RHS's do *not* vanish for $f = f_{ab}$ but are just rotations of the $\mathcal{L}_a$ and $\mathcal{R}_b$ charges about the z axis.

$$\sum_i \left[\, [[f_{ab}, \mathcal{L}_i]_\star\, , \mathcal{L}_i]_\star\ , \, \mathcal{R}_z \,\right]_\star = 2i\hbar^3 \sum_c \varepsilon_{b3c} f_{ac}\ .$$
$$\sum_i \left[\, [[f_{ab}, \mathcal{R}_i]_\star\, , \mathcal{R}_i]_\star\ , \, \mathcal{L}_z \,\right]_\star = 2i\hbar^3 \sum_{c=1,2,3} \varepsilon_{a3c} f_{cb}\ .$$

For this particular example, then, the total effects of the chosen invariants in the 6-brackets are

$$[f_{ab}, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y, \mathcal{L}_z, \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y]_\star = -i\hbar^5 \sum_c \varepsilon_{b3c} f_{ac}\ ,$$
$$[f_{ab}, \mathcal{R}_x, \mathcal{R}_y, \mathcal{R}_z, \mathcal{L}_x, \mathcal{L}_y]_\star = -i\hbar^5 \sum_c \varepsilon_{a3c} f_{cb}\ .$$

It remains to link up the QNB approach with the $\star$ eigenvalue equation for static WFs, as needed to develop the spectral theory in such a formalism. This must be described in detail elsewhere. However an essential point is contained in the previous formulas. A complete spectral theory in the NB framework requires solving totally symmetrized bracket eigenvalue equations, of the form

$$\lambda f = \{I_1, I_2, \cdots, I_k, f\}_\star\ ,$$

for the allowed *net* eigenvalues λ, where in general $[I_i, I_j]_\star \neq 0$. These net eigenvalue equations set the different time scales under NB evolution as expressed above. They are natural generalizations of the anticommutator eigenvalue equations encountered in the standard spectral theory of (special) Jordan algebras [**15, 16**]. Nevertheless, we have not found a complete discussion of such equations in the literature.

Acknowledgments. We thank Y Nambu and Y Nutku for helpful discussions. We also thank the organizers of the superintegrability workshop, especially P Winternitz, for the opportunity to present this research. The warm hospitality of the Centre de recherches mathématiques, Université de Montréal, is most gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix: Nambu quantum mechanics of the isotropic oscillator

The analysis above can also be carried out using conventional Hilbert space operator techniques. Rather than repeat our previous discussion, we take another example to illustrate operator methods. (For a thorough discussion of the ideas in this Appendix, see [**31**]. This later paper contains a more complete list of references.)

Consider the n dimensional oscillator using the standard lowering/raising operator basis that gives the commutator algebra

$$[a_i, b_j] = \hbar\delta_{ij}\ , \quad [a_i, a_j] = 0 = [b_i, b_j]\ .$$

Construct the usual bilinear charges that realize the $u\,(n)$ algebra

$$N_{ij} \equiv b_i a_j\ , \quad [N_{ij}, N_{kl}] = \hbar\,(N_{il}\delta_{jk} - N_{kj}\delta_{il})\ .$$

Then the isotropic Hamiltonian is

$$H = \omega \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(N_i + \frac{1}{2}\hbar \right) \ , \quad N_i \equiv N_{ii} \ ,$$

which gives the n^2 conservation laws $[H, N_{ij}] = 0$. Now when we consider the isotropic oscillator dynamics using quantum Nambu brackets (QNBs) we obtain the main result for oscillator $2n$-brackets in the form of a theorem.

Isotropic Oscillator Theorem (reductio ad dimidium): Let $\mathsf{N} = N_1 + N_2 + \cdots + N_n$ and intercalate the $n-1$ non-diagonal operators $N_{i\,i+1}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n-1$ into a $2n$-bracket with the n mutually commuting N_j for $j = 1, \cdots, n$ to find

$$\begin{aligned}[f, N_1, N_{12}, N_2, N_{23}, \cdots, N_{n-1}, N_{n-1\,n}, N_n] &= \hbar^{n-1} \left\{ [f, \mathsf{N}] \, , N_{12}, N_{23}, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n} \right\} \\ &= \hbar^{n-1} \left[\{ f, N_{12}, N_{23}, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n} \} \, , \mathsf{N} \right] \ .\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used a fully symmetrized Jordan operator product [**14**] as generalized by Kurosh [**28**]

$$\{A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k\} \equiv \sum_{\substack{\text{all } k! \text{ perms } \{p_1,p_2,\cdots,p_k\} \\ \text{of the indices } \{1,2,\cdots,k\}}} A_{p_1} A_{p_2} \cdots A_{p_k} \ .$$

This was introduced by Pascual Jordan, in the bilinear form, to render non-Abelian algebras into Abelian algebras at the expense of non-associativity. We have also used the fully antisymmetrized Nambu operator product, or QNB [**13**],

$$[A_1, A_2, \cdots, A_k] \equiv \sum_{\substack{\text{all } k! \text{ perms } \{p_1,p_2,\cdots,p_k\} \\ \text{of the indices } \{1,2,\cdots,k\}}} (-1)^{\pi(p)} \, A_{p_1} A_{p_2} \cdots A_{p_k} \ .$$

The non-diagonal operators $N_{i\,i+1}$ do not all commute among themselves, nor with all the N_j, but their non-Abelian properties are encountered in the above Jordan and Nambu products in a rather minimal way. Only adjacent entries in the list $N_{12}, N_{23}, N_{34}, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n}$ fail to commute. Also in the list of $2n-1$ generators within the original QNB, each N_j fails to commute only with the adjacent $N_{j-1\,j}$ and $N_{j\,j+1}$. Such a list of invariants constitutes a "Hamiltonian path" through the algebra[5].

Proof of the Oscillator Theorem: Linearity in each argument and total antisymmetry of the Nambu bracket allow us to replace any one of the N_i by the sum N. We choose to replace $N_n \rightarrow \mathsf{N}$, hence to obtain

$$[f, N_1, N_{12}, N_2, \cdots, N_{n-1}, N_{n-1\,n}, N_n] = [f, N_1, N_{12}, N_2, \cdots, N_{n-1}, N_{n-1\,n}, \mathsf{N}] \ .$$

Now since $[\mathsf{N}, N_{ij}] = 0$, the commutator resolution of the $2n$-bracket implies that N must appear "locked" in a commutator with f, and therefore f cannot appear in any other commutator. But then N_1 commutes with all the remaining free N_{ij} except N_{12}. So N_1 must be locked in $[N_1, N_{12}]$. Continuing in this way, N_2 must be locked in $[N_2, N_{23}]$, etc., until finally N_{n-1} is locked in $[N_{n-1}, N_{n-1\,n}]$. Thus all $2n$ entries have been paired and locked in the indicated n commutators, i.e. they are all "zipped-up". Moreover, these n commutators can and will appear as products ordered in all $n!$ possible ways with coefficients $+1$ since interchanging a pair of commutators requires interchanging two pairs of the original entries in the bracket. Thus we conclude

---

[5] There are other Hamiltonian paths through the algebra. A different set of $2n-1$ invariants which leads to an equivalent theorem can be obtained just by taking an arbitrarily ordered list of the mutually commuting N_i, and then intercalating non-diagonal generators to match adjacent indices on the N_i. That is, for any permutation of the indices $\{p_1, \cdots, p_n\}$, we have: $\left[f, N_{p_1}, N_{p_1p_2}, N_{p_2}, N_{p_2p_3}, N_{p_3}, \cdots, N_{p_{n-1}}, N_{p_{n-1}\,p_n}, N_{p_n}\right] = \hbar^{n-1} \left\{ [f, \mathsf{N}] \, , N_{p_1p_2}, N_{p_2p_3}, \cdots, N_{p_{n-1}\,p_n} \right\} = \hbar^{n-1} \left[\left\{ f, N_{p_1p_2}, N_{p_2p_3}, \cdots, N_{p_{n-1}\,p_n} \right\} , \mathsf{N} \right]$.

$$[f, N_1, N_{12}, N_2, \cdots, N_{n-1}, N_{n-1\,n}, N_n] = \{[f, \mathsf{N}], [N_1, N_{12},], \cdots, [N_{n-1}, N_{n-1\,n}]\} \ .$$

Now all the paired N_{ij} commutators evaluate as $[N_{i-1}, N_{i-1\,i}] = \hbar N_{i-1\,i}$, so we have

$$[f, N_1, N_{12}, N_2, \cdots, N_{n-1}, N_{n-1\,n}, N_n] = \hbar^{n-1} \{[f, \mathsf{N}], N_{12}, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n}\} \ .$$

Finally the commutator with N may be performed either before or after the Jordan product of f with all the $N_{i-1\,i}$, since again $[\mathsf{N}, N_{ij}] = 0$. Hence

$$\{[f, \mathsf{N}], N_{12}, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n}\} = [\{f, N_{12}, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n}\}, \mathsf{N}] \ . \quad \blacksquare$$

The oscillator theorem is a remarkable relation. The invariants which are in involution (i.e. the Cartan subalgebra of $u(n)$) are separated out of the QNB into a single commutator involving their sum, hence H/ω, to yield a time derivative, while the invariants which do not commute ($n-1$ of them, corresponding in number to the rank of $su(n)$) are swept into a Jordan product. As in the N-sphere examples, this helps to clarify why the Leibniz rules fail when time evolution is expressed using QNBs. As is fairly well-known, evolution under the QNB does not satisfy the trivial Leibniz property: $[fg, N_1, N_{12}, N_2, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n}, N_n] \neq f[g, N_1, N_{12}, N_2, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n}, N_n] + [f, N_1, N_{12}, N_2, \cdots, N_{n-1\,n}, N_n]\, g$. But here the failure of this Leibniz rule for the Nambu bracket has been linked to the intervention of a generalized Jordan product involving non-commuting invariants.

References

[1] P Tempesta, A V Turbiner, P Winternitz, J Math Phys **42** (2001) 4248-4257 [hep-th/0011209];
M Rodriguez and P Winternitz, J Math Phys **43** (2002) 1309-1322 [math-ph/0110018];
E Kalnins, J Kress, and P Winternitz, J Math Phys **43** (2002) 970-983 [math-ph/0108015];
S Wojciechowski, Phys Lett **A95** (1983) 279-281;
R Caseiro, J-P Françoise, and R Sasaki, J Math Phys **42** (2001) 5329-5340 [hep-th/0102153].
[2] G Velo and J Wess, Nuov Cim **A1** (1971) 177;
H Lin, W Lin, and R Sugano, Nucl Phys **B16** (1970) 416.
[3] M Lakshmanan and K Eswaran, J Phys **A8** (1975) 1658;
also see, A Leznov, Nucl Phys **B640** (2002) 469-480 [hep-th/0203225]
[4] P Higgs, J Phys **A12** (1979) 309.
[5] H Leemon, J Phys **A12** (1979) 489.
[6] J Moyal, Proc Camb Phil Soc **45** (1949) 99-124
[7] T Curtright, D Fairlie, and C Zachos, Phys Rev **D58** (1998) 025002
[8] C Zachos, Int J Mod Phys **A17** (2002) 297-316 [hep-th/0110114]
[9] H Weyl, Z Phys **46** (1927) 1; also reviewed in H Weyl (1931) *The Theory of Groups and Quantum Mechanics*, Dover, New York
[10] H Groenewold, Physica **12** (1946) 405-460;
also see a concise summary, B Leaf, J Math Phys **9** (1968) 65).
[11] J Hietarinta, J Math Phys **25** (1984) 1833-1840.
[12] M Berry, Philos Trans R Soc London **A287** (1977) 237-271
[13] Y Nambu, "Generalized Hamiltonian mechanics", Phys Rev **D7** (1973) 2405-2412
[14] P Jordan, "Über die Multiplikation quantenmechanischer Größen", Z Phys **80** (1933) 285-291.
[15] P Jordan, Göttinger Nachr. (1932) 569; Göttinger Nachr. (1933) 209.
[16] P Jordan, J. von Neumann, and E. Wigner, Ann Math **35** (1934) 29-64.

[17] J Hietarinta , J Phys **A30** (1997) L27-L33;
N Mukunda and E Sudarshan, Phys Rev **D13** (1976) 2846-2850;
R Chatterjee, Lett Math Phys **36** (1996) 117-126

[18] L Takhtajan, Commun Math Phys **160** (1994) 295-316 [hep-th/9301111];
V T Filipov, Sib Math Jou, **26** (1985) 879-891.

[19] C Gonera and Y Nutku, Phys Lett **A285** (2001) 301-306; Y Nutku, "Quantization of superintegrable systems with Nambu-Poisson brackets", these proceedings.

[20] D Fairlie, Proc Camb Phil Soc **60** (1964) 581-586

[21] F Bayen, M Flato, C Fronsdal, A Lichnerowicz, and D Sternheimer, Lett Math Phys **1** (1977) 521-530; Ann Phys **111** (1978) 61; *ibid* 111

[22] T Curtright and C Zachos, Mod Phys Lett **A16** (2001) 2381-2385 [hep-th/0105226]

[23] T Curtright, T Uematsu, and C Zachos, Nucl Phys **B469** (1996) 488 [hep-th/0011137]

[24] E Braaten, T Curtright, and C Zachos, Nucl Phys **B260** (1985) 630

[25] G Dito, M Flato, D Sternheimer, and L Takhtajan, Commun Math Phys **183** (1997) 1-22 [hep-th/9602016];
G Dito and M Flato, Lett Math Phys **39** (1997) 107-125 [hep-th/9609114];
H Awata, M Li, D Minic, and T Yoneya, **JHEP** 0102 (2001) 013 [hep-th/9906248];
D Minic and C-H Tze, [hep-th/0202173]

[26] B V Fedosov, "A simple geometrical construction of deformation quantization", J Diff Geom **40** (1994) 213-238.

[27] N Reshetikhin and M Yakimov, "Deformation Quantization of Lagrangian Fiber Bundles", Conference Moshe Flato 1999, vol. 2, 269-288, Kluwer Acad. Publ. 2000 [math.QA/9907164].

[28] A G Kurosh, "Multioperator Rings and Algebras", Russian Math Surveys **24** (1969) 1-13.

[29] T L Curtright and C K Zachos, "Deformation Quantization of Superintegrable Systems and Nambu Mechanics", New J Phys **4** (2002) 83.1-83.16 [hep-th/0205063]

[30] C K Zachos and T L Curtright, "Deformation Quantization, Superintegrability, and Nambu Mechanics", Invited talk at Wigner Centennial Conference, in Commemoration of the 100th year of Wigner's Birth, Pecs, Hungary, 7-12 Jul 2002. Heavy Ion Physics, *in press* [hep-th/0210170]

[31] T Curtright and C Zachos, "Classical and Quantum Nambu Mechanics", submitted to Phys Rev D [hep-th/0212267]

Department of Physics, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida 33124-8046
E-mail address: `curtright@physics.miami.edu`

High Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439-4815
E-mail address: `zachos@hep.anl.gov`